



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,884	01/14/2004	Mark E. Molander	SJ0920030073USI	5189
29683 7590 12/21/2006 HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			EXAMINER SPITTLE, MATTHEW D	
			ART UNIT 2111	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/21/2006	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/757,884	Applicant(s) MOLANDER ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew D. Spittle	Art Unit 2111	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Matthew D. Spittle. (3) Jerry Stanton (46,008).
 (2) Mark Rinehart. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 December 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: PTO-413A received 12/13/2006 (attached)

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Moran, Jeffries, Roth.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner indicated to Attorney for Applicant that amending the independent claims to include the limitations of claim 8 along with the procedure as defined by the specification in paragraph 37, lines 9 - 11 would overcome the current rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Phone: (203) 925-9400
Fax: (203) 944-0245
Email: Patent@HSPatent.com
www.HSPatent.com

Harrington & Smith, LLP

Fax

To: Art Unit 2111;

From: Jerry Stanton

Attn: Examiner Andrew Spittle

Fax: 571-273-2467

Pages: 2; including this cover page

Phone: 571-272-2467

Date: 12/13/2006

Re: Ser. No. 10/757,884

CC:

(our docket 909B.0031)

☐ **Urgent** ☒ **For Review** ☐ **Please Comment** ☒ **Please Reply** ☐ **Please Recycle**

Dear Examiner Spittle,

Subject matter for a requested teleconference:

Claim 8 recites a microprocessor, within the flash memory pocket sized body, coupled between an actuator and a connector that sends a request for the operating system of the host device to execute an interrupt command. Against claim 8 was cited Jeffries (Figure 1, item 24) or Roth (paragraph 21; Figure 1, items 152, 108). Moran also teaches a controller 12.

Jeffries shows a hard drive 12 within a drive carrier 14 connected to a backplane 18 at a bay 20, and an SCSI controller 24 disposed opposite the backplane 18 from the drive carrier 14 and drive 12, nearer the server 11. The carrier/drive assembly is removable (col. 4 lines 9-21), and so is not within the same body as the backplane 18 or SCSI controller 24. Teaching away is at col. 4 lines 9-13 in that a single SCSI controller 24 controls multiple drive 12/carrier 14 assemblies.

Roth shows a device 150 having an input device 152, which may be a button or switch (paragraph 0020). A CPU 102 and a peripheral bus controller 108 are disposed within a computer system 100. The device 150 is attached to the computer system 100 by a detachable connection (paragraphs 0010, 0020 and 0023). The input device 152 is not a microcontroller; the CPU 102 and the peripheral bus controller 108 are not within the body of the external storage device 150.

(continued on page 2)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This fax transmission (and/or the attachments accompanying it) may contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is protected by attorney-client privilege. The information is only for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this transmission is illegal under the law. If you have received this transmission in error, we would appreciate your promptly notifying the sender, and then please destroy all copies of the transmission.

December 13, 2006


10/757,884; page 2

Moran has a controller 12 coupled to a flash memory 18, USB interface 14 and user interface 20. The controller 12 of Moran does not send a request for the operating system of the host device to execute an interrupt command as in claim 8. At para 0022, the controller reformats read, write, and erase commands between interfaces 14 and 16, and reformats data between those interfaces. The controller is limited to functionality necessary to serve as a data storage and exchange device at para 0029. Reformatting is different in kind than a request to a host device to execute an interrupt command, so is a teaching away from claim 8.

More detailed disclosure relevant to the interrupt command is at para 00037 of the application's written description.

I look forward to discussing the above with you; please contact me at your discretion: 203-925-9400, ext 12.

Sincerely,



Jerry Stanton
Reg. No. 46,008